

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/615,193	07/09/2003	Masayuki Tsuchiya	000138A	9222
38834	7590 09/28/2006		EXAMINER	
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP			IP, SIKYIN	
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW SUITE 700		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			1742	
			DATE MAILED: 09/28/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		,			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/615,193	TSUCHIYA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Sikyin Ip	1742			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror e, cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed on the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/3/	<u>06</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ∑ This					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	<i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 5 and 6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed as a policant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct to the policies of the	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is old	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat prity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summan	y (PTO-413)			
?) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Date				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over USP 5638889 to Sugiura et al.

Sugiura discloses that Al-Mg alloy or Mg-Al alloy is heated to solidus temperature (A) with high heat rate (about 3.7 °C/sec), heated at relative slower heating rate to above solidus temperature/semi-molten (B), then kept at temperature (C) (see Figure 12 and col. 14, lines 37-55). Heating rate between temperatures A and B is slower than room temperature to temperature A in order to obtain uniform temperature/zero temperature gradient (col. 14, lines 4247). The heating is applicable to iron alloy also (col. 15, lines 54-58).

Art Unit: 1742

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over reference as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of acknowledged prior art admission.

Sugiura discloses the features substantially as claimed as set forth in the rejection above except for step of setting a sonic velocity. However, acknowledged prior art admission in paragraph bridging pages 13-14 of instant specification discloses it is conventional to use ultrasonic velocity to inspect cast metal in the same field of endeavor or the analogous metallurgical art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art of the cited references at the time the invention was made to use ultrasonic velocity for inspect cast product because it is conventional and an ordinary skill artisan motivated by a reasonable expectation of success to use the known process in order to obtain all of the known benefits. In re Aller, et al., 105 USPQ 233.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5-6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant is reminded that when amendment and/or revision is required, applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.121 and 37 C.F.R. Part §41.37 (c)(1)(v).

Examiner Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to S. Ip whose telephone number is (571) 272-1241. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 5:30 A.M. to 2:00 P.M.

Art Unit: 1742

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dr. Roy V. King, can be reached on (571)-272-1244.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SIKYIN IP PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 1742 Page 4

S. Ip September 26, 2006